IN THE HIGH COURT OF UTTARANCHAL AT NAINITAL

Appeal From Order No. 565 of 2001
(Old No. 306 of 1994)

New India Assurance Company
Limited, Haldwani ……..…….. Appellant

Versus

Kundan Singh & others …… Respondents

Mr. R.B. Agarwal, learned counsel for the appellant.
Mr. Amit Bhatt, learned counsel for the respondents.

Hon'ble P.C. Verma, A.C.J.
Hon'ble P.C. Pant, J.

(Delivered by Hon'ble P.C. Pant, J.)

This is an appeal under Section 173 of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 against the judgment and award dated 16.08.1994 passed by Shri P.D. Dhaundiyal, the then learned IV Additional District Judge / Presiding Officer, Motor Accident Claims Tribunal, Nainital whereby in M.A.C. Case No. 200 of 1988 the Tribunal has awarded Rs. 90,000/- as compensation to the applicants.

2. Brief facts of the case giving rise to the present appeal are that on 10.01.1988, Kheema Devi (deceased) was travelling from Haldwani to Almora in a bus bearing registration No. URN 9428. The driver of the bus was driving it rashly and negligently. When the bus reached near Khairana, the driver lost control of the bus and it fell in a gorge and caught fire. Smt. Kheema Devi (deceased) and many other passengers got burn injuries and died. The deceased was 31 years of age. The deceased was a housewife and she used to do farming also. Shri Kundan Singh, claimant No. 1 is widower of the deceased while Master

Narendra Singh (claimant No. 2), Ms. Mamta (claimant No. 3) and Master Kamal Singh (claimant No. 4) are daughter and sons respectively of the deceased. Claimant Nos. 2, 3 & 4 were minors. Opposite party No. 1, Kanta Devi was owner of the vehicle and New India Assurance Company Ltd. (present appellant) was the company with whom the vehicle was ensured. Opposite party No. 4 in the petition was the driver of the vehicle in question.

3. In the written statement before the trial Court, the owner of the vehicle has admitted the accident and death of the passengers including that of Kheema Devi. However, the opposite parties including the owner have denied allegations that the bus was being driven rashly and negligently by the driver of the bus. Opposite party No. 2 (present appellant) has taken a further plea that the owner of the bus has no permit to ply the vehicle between Haldwani and Almora.

4. Learned Presiding officer of the trial after examining the pleas, framed following issues:

i) Whether, the bus was being driven at the relevant time for and on behalf of opposite party No. 4? If so, its effect?

ii) Whether, the accident in question, on account of which Kheema Devi had died was due to rash and negligent driving of the vehicle?

iii) Whether, on the date of the alleged accident the opposite party No. 1 was the owner of the vehicle and had no control over the vehicle and its driver?

iv) Whether, the bus was owned by opposite party No. 4 on the date of accident, if so, its effect?

v) Whether, at the relevant time bus was being driven without valid permit for the route in question? If so, its effect?

vi) Which of the opposite parties is liable to pay compensation to the claimants?

vii) To what amount of compensation, if any, the claimants are entitled?

5. After recording the evidence of the parties and hearing them, learned Presiding officer of the Tribunal has found that the accident in question has taken place due to the rash and negligent driving on part of the driver, who was employed by opposite party No. 1 as owner of the bus. The Tribunal further found that since the bus was plying under Kumaon Motor Owners Union Ltd., hence it had the route permit. The Tribunal also came to the conclusion that the claimants are entitled to compensation to the tune of Rs. 90,000/- and the New India Assurance company Ltd. with whom the vehicle was ensured was liable to pay it. Accordingly, the Award was passed for the sum along with 10% interest on the amount of compensation. Aggrieved with the Award, New India Assurance company Ltd. has preferred this appeal.

6. We have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record. Evidence on record shows that the deceased was a housewife and she also used to do farming besides taking care of the animals as such the assessment of her services in terms of money was assessed at Rs. 700/- per month. Now, after her death, her husband has to take services of some other person. Therefore, an amount of Rs. 7,00/- per month was rightly assessed as loss on account of death of Kheema Devi to her family. The annual loss thus comes to Rs. 8,400. The age of the deceased was 30 years and as such looking to the uncertainty of life, on account of which her family had to remain deprived of her services now, the total loss was rightly assessed ten times at Rs. 84,000/-. Due to untimely demise of the Kheema Devi i.e. mother of the children and wife of Shri Kundan Singh, an

amount of Rs. 6,000/- on account of loss of parenthood and mental pain and sufferings and also rightly assessed. The total amount of compensation thus arrived is as under:

84000 + 6000 = 90,000/-

This total amount of compensation is liable to be paid by M/s New India Assurance Company Ltd. i.e. the present appellant in this case.

7. We find no fault in the order passed by the Claims Tribunal while awarding compensation to the extent of Rs. 90,000/- along with 10% interest per annum from the date of petition till the date of actual payment. Therefore, the appeal is devoid of merits and is, hereby dismissed. No order as to costs. Amount deposited in this Court by the appellant company shall be transmitted to the M.A.C.T. concerned for its disbursement amongst the claimants.

(P.C. Pant, J.) **(P.C. Verma, A.C.J.)**

Dt: 07.07.2004
HN